

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/830,976	Applicant(s) HAYDOCK ET AL.	
	Examiner Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) Laurence Hyman (4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 September 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 41-47 and 91.

Identification of prior art discussed: Anderson et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner discussed with Mr. Hyman for Applicant that the claims 1-40 and 48-90 were in condition for allowance but that the claims drawn to the apparatus (claims 41-47 and 91) were not free of the prior art. The examiner informed Mr. Hyman that a patent by Anderson et al applied to the claims 41-47 and 91. To expedite prosecution, the examiner requested that the claims 41-47 and 91 be canceled from the allowed claims. Mr. Hyman requested a written response be submitted..